

AD A139632

12

AD F300 397

MEMORANDUM REPORT ARBRL-MR-03338

BLAST LOADING OF CLOSURES FOR USE  
ON SHELTERS-II

George A. Coulter

February 1984

20030109263



US ARMY ARMAMENT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER  
**BALLISTIC RESEARCH LABORATORY**  
ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND, MARYLAND

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

DTIC  
ELECTE  
MAR 23 1984  
S B D

DTIC FILE COPY

84 03 23 010

## **REPRODUCTION QUALITY NOTICE**

This document is the best quality available. The copy furnished to DTIC contained pages that may have the following quality problems:

- Pages smaller or larger than normal.
- Pages with background color or light colored printing.
- Pages with small type or poor printing; and or
- Pages with continuous tone material or color photographs.

Due to various output media available these conditions may or may not cause poor legibility in the microfiche or hardcopy output you receive.

☐ If this block is checked, the copy furnished to DTIC contained pages with color printing, that when reproduced in Black and White, may change detail of the original copy.

(This document contains  
blank pages that were  
not filmed)

Destroy this report when it is no longer needed.  
Do not return it to the originator.

Additional copies of this report may be obtained  
from the National Technical Information Service,  
U. S. Department of Commerce, Springfield, Virginia  
22161.

The findings in this report are not to be construed as  
an official Department of the Army position, unless  
so designated by other authorized documents.

*The use of trade names or manufacturers' names in this report  
does not constitute endorsement of any commercial product.*

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER Memorandum Report ARBRL-MR-03338	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. A12000 122	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) BLAST LOADING OF CLOSURES FOR USE ON SHELTERS-II	5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Final	
	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER	
7. AUTHOR(s) George A. Coulter	8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)	
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS US Army Ballistic Research Laboratory, ARDC ATTN: DRSMC-BLT(A) Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS No. EMW-E-1025 Work Unit 1123C	
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS US Army AMCCOM, ARDC Ballistic Research Laboratory, ATTN: DRSMC-BLA-S(A) Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005	12. REPORT DATE February 1984	
	13. NUMBER OF PAGES 60	
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) UNCLASSIFIED	
	15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE	
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)  Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES  This project was funded by Federal Emergency Management Agency, 500 C Street, SW, Washington, DC, under project order No. EMW-E-1025, Project Officer, Dr. Michael A. Pachuta.		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Aluminum Panels                      Failure Loads Blast Closures                        Key Worker Shelters Blast Doors                            Ultimate Failure Blast Loading                         Wood Panels		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)  Results are presented for the blast loading of expedient closures intended for use in the key worker shelter pressure range. Failure levels were determined for long duration blast loads from the BRL 2.44 m simulator. Loading data and high speed photographs describe the failure modes.		

## SUMMARY

### I. INTRODUCTION

The work reported here is a part of a research project, funded by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), Interagency Agreement No. EMW-E-1025, to upgrade existing shelters in both the key worker and host area. The objective of this study is to determine suitable shelter entry structures and non-accessway closures. Working curves for the selection of expedient closure materials versus opening size were checked for the key worker pressure level.

### II. EXPERIMENT

Closures were constructed from aluminum skins/I-beams and plywood skin/thick beams. Opening widths covered were 76.2 cm (30 in.) and 121.9 cm (48 in.). Blast loading was applied to the closures by the BRL 2.44 m shock tube. All closures were loosely supported at the end of the shock tube. Pressure time histories of the input loads are given along with high speed photographs of the closures' failure modes. Average debris velocities were calculated for the closure fragments during breakout.

### III. RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

Loading-time records for the closures are shown in the body of the report. The materials versus opening curve for expedient closure materials has been verified for the key worker blast level. It should be noted that only the best grade wood will serve as closures at this level. Due to the briefness of this effort, no poles or posts were tested. Only planks and beams were used to construct the wood closures. The aluminum welded skin/I-beam closures were found to be unsatisfactory due to general failure of the plug welds. Other fasteners would have probably proved more effective.

It is recommended that the material versus opening curves now being used at 275.8 kPa (40 psi) not be used over that level. Revised handbook curves should be published if it is desired to exceed this pressure level.

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By _____	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Special
A-1	

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS . . . . .	7
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	9
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	11
II. TEST PROCEDURE . . . . .	11
A. Test Fixture . . . . .	12
B. Closures . . . . .	12
C. Instrumentation . . . . .	12
III. RESULTS . . . . .	20
A. Data Table . . . . .	20
B. Loading Records . . . . .	20
C. High Speed Photographs . . . . .	20
D. Failure Modes . . . . .	35
IV. ANALYSIS . . . . .	35
A. Aluminum Skin/I-Beam Closure . . . . .	46
B. Wood Beam Closure . . . . .	46
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	49
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .	52
REFERENCES . . . . .	53
DISTRIBUTION LIST . . . . .	55

# LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure	Page
1. Test Fixture - 2.44 m Shock Tube. . . . .	13
2. Aluminum Skin/I-Beam Closure. . . . .	14
3. Wood Beam Closure . . . . .	15
4. Wood Plank/Sand Bag Closure . . . . .	16
5. Wood Beam Closure - Small Opening . . . . .	18
6. Schematic of Data Acquisition - Reduction System. . . . .	19
7. Input Loading - Time Records. . . . .	22
8. Aluminum Skin/I-Beam Closure - 247 kPa (35.8 psi) . . . . .	26
9. Pine Beam Closure - 351 kPa (50.9 psi). . . . .	29
10. Pine Beam Closure - 347 kPa (50.3 psi). . . . .	32
11. Sand Bag/Plank Closure - 344 kPa (49.9 psi) . . . . .	36
12. Failure Mode for Aluminum Closure - 247 kPa (35.8 psi). . . . .	38
13. Failure Mode for Pine Beam Closure - 347 kPa (50.3 psi) . . . . .	39
14. Oak Beam Closure - 342 kPa (49.6 psi) . . . . .	41
15. Oak Plank/Sand Bag - 344 kPa (49.9 psi) . . . . .	42
16. Oak Beam Closure, 76.2 cm (30 in.). . . . .	44
17. Calculation of Stiffness Factor for Aluminum Skin/I-Beam Closure . . . . .	47
18. Material Thickness Required to Close Various Openings at the 345 kPa Ground Range . . . . .	51

# LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Test Conditions for Closures. . . . .	21
2. Material Properties of the Closures . . . . .	45
3. Values for Ultimate Failure . . . . .	50



## I. INTRODUCTION

This report describes a study conducted at the Ballistic Research Laboratory (BRL) which was funded by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), Interagency Agreement No. EMW-E-1025, Work Unit 1123C. The general objective of the work being reported was to test a variety of materials suitable for the upgrading of shelter entry structures and non-accessway closures. These are intended for use at the key worker level of blast pressure.

Previous work at BRL<sup>1-4</sup> sponsored by FEMA has verified design procedures<sup>5</sup> indicating that plywood and plywood stressed-skin panels are effective closures for small vent-type openings in the risk area (345 kPa, 50 psi) if there are suitable supporting fixtures. The present research was aimed at determining the material thickness required to close entry way-sized openings.

Material thickness curves were to be verified for inclusion into the revised Industrial Protection Manual.<sup>6</sup>

The types of closures prepared for testing were aluminum I-beams with aluminum skins, wood beams, and wood planks protected with sand bags.

## II. TEST PROCEDURE

The test fixture, closures, and recording/data reduction instrumentation are briefly described in this section.

---

<sup>1</sup>G.A. Coulter, "Debris Hazard from Blast Loaded Plywood Sheet Closures," Memorandum Report ARBRL-MR-02917, Ballistic Research Laboratory, March 1979 (AD A071460).

<sup>2</sup>G.A. Coulter, "Blast Loading of Construction Materials and Closure Designs," Memorandum Report ARBRL-MR-02947, Ballistic Research Laboratory, August 1979 (AD A077116).

<sup>3</sup>G.A. Coulter, "Blast Loading of Wall Panels and Commercial Closures," Memorandum Report ARBRL-MR-03154, Ballistic Research Laboratory, February 1982 (AD B063574L).

<sup>4</sup>G.A. Coulter, "Blast Loading of Closures for Use on Shelters," Memorandum Report ARBRL-MR-03279, Ballistic Research Laboratory, June 1983 (AD A130028).

<sup>5</sup>H.L. Murphy, "Upgrading Basements for Combined Nuclear Effects: Predesigned Expedient Options II," SRI Project 6876 Technical Report, July 1980.

<sup>6</sup>"Industrial Protection Manual, Booklet 10," SSI Report No. 8011, Scientific Service, Inc., June 1981 (AD A102631).

#### A. Test Fixture

The test fixture used was the same as that used in References 3 and 4. It was attached to the end of the BRL 2.44 m shock tube<sup>7</sup> in the usual manner. A rectangular opening 1.219 x 1.676 m (4 x 5.5 ft) was used for all the tests except for the last one. The opening was changed to 0.762 m x 1.676 m (30 in. x 5.5 ft) for this shot.

All panels were loosely supported on the long vertical sides of the opening of the test fixture. Small corner tabs kept the closures from falling back into the shock tube. The vertical mounting position of the closures allowed reflected pressure to be applied by the blast wave. Figure 1 shows the test fixture used.

#### B. Closures

Sketches of the closures are shown in Figures 2-5.

The aluminum closure of Figure 2 consisted of six I-beams spanning the short dimension of the test fixture opening. The closure overhang was 7.62 cm (3 in.) on each of the two long bearing sides. The aluminum face sheets were plug welded to each I-beam with groups of eleven welds on each beam. The welds averaged about 1.27 cm (0.5 in.) in diameter.

Figure 3 shows a sketch of the wood beam closure. Two were made with pine beams and one from oak beams. The upstream plywood served as an air seal and was not intended to add any strength to the closure. Side support overhang was 15.24 cm (6 in.) on each of the long vertical bearing sides.

Figure 4-A shows the oak plank closure and Figure 4-B how it was mounted in the shock tube with sand bags.

For the smaller panel width the test fixture opening was modified to a width of 76.2 cm (30 in.) by adding vertical side supports before the last shot. Figure 5 shows the closure. All wood closures were banded as shown in the sketches to allow easier handling of the closures.

#### C. Instrumentation

The blast load applied to the closure was measured either on the end plate of the test fixture or 61 cm (24 in.) upstream when the sand bags were in place. See Figure 4-B above. The latter location used was just in front of the sand bags. The output from the quartz transducer (PCB Model 113A24) was suitably amplified and recorded by the FM Honeywell 7600 tape recorder. Records were available for a quick-look from an on-site oscillograph to determine needed changes for the next test. See Figure 6 for a diagram of the data acquisition-reduction system used.

---

<sup>7</sup>B.P. Bertrand, "BRL Dual Shock Tube Facility," Ballistic Research Laboratory Memorandum Report 2001, August 1969 (AD 693264).







Figure 1. Test Fixture - 2.44 m Shock Tube.

DIMENSIONS IN CENTIMETRES



I-BEAM DETAIL  
6061-T6 AL, 137 LONG  
6 REQ'D

Figure 2. Aluminum Skin/I-Beam Closure.



WOOD, BEAM: PINE, GRADE 2 SPIB, STD WCLIB & WWPA, FED MM-L-751 or  
OAK, ROUGH, SQUARE EDGE, FED MM-L-736

Figure 3. Wood Beam Closure.





Figure 4. Wood Plank/Sand Bag Closure.



B. Wood Plank Closure in Shock Tube.

Figure 4 (Cont'd). Wood Plank/Sand Bag Closure.

DIMENSIONS IN CENTIMETRES




Figure 5. Wood Beam Closure - Small Opening.






Figure 6. Schematic of Data Acquisition - Reduction System.

The mode of failure and debris pattern for the closures were recorded by means of a high speed camera (Red Lakes HYCAM) operating at 500 pictures per second (PPS). Debris average velocities were calculated from these photographs.

### III. RESULTS

The results are given in the data table, as pressure-time loading records, and in high speed photographs.

#### A. Data Table

The test conditions for each type of closure are listed in Table 1. Ambient conditions, loading pressures, opening widths, and damage results are listed for each shot in the series.

Two general ranges of loading were applied to the closures. The first included 253 and 247 kPa (36.7 and 35.8 psi) applied to the aluminum panel closures. A level of loading at about 345 kPa (50 psi) was planned for all the wood beam closures. The variation was found to be between 342 and 351 kPa (49.6 and 50.9 psi) for the test series on the wood closures. Total failure occurred at these ranges except for the oak beam closure exposed in Shot 8-83-7.

#### B. Loading Records

The loading records are shown in Figure 7 in order of the shot sequence. Shots 8-83-2 and 8-83-3 are for the two aluminum panels. Shots 8-83-4 and 8-83-5 are for the two pine beam closures. Shot 8-83-6 is for the oak planks with sand bag protection. Shot 8-83-7 is the input for the oak beam closure. The increase in pressure after about 150 ms is caused by the cold gas part of the shock wave loading the closure. All the other pressure-time records show a decay in pressure after the shock front, caused by the closures breaking. A rarefaction wave from the opened closure partially decays the expected flat topped input wave.

#### C. High Speed Photographs

The high speed camera was positioned to the south of the end of the shock tube. The camera's field of view covered from the end flange to about 2.4 m beyond the flange.

Films were obtained for Shots 8-83-2, 8-83-4, 8-83-5, and 8-83-6 with a framing rate of 500 PPS. No film is shown of Shot 8-83-7 since the closure did not blow out. Failure for the aluminum closure was shortly after impact. By about 14 ms (Figure 8) the closure was exiting the flange opening. Rotation accompanied the translation. The average translational velocity after 62 ms was about 45 m/sec.

Shots 8-83-4 and 8-83-5 (Figures 9 and 10) show the pine closures failed by breaking along a vertical centerline of the flange opening. Large sections of the beams rotated outward away from the shock tube axis.

TABLE 1. TEST CONDITIONS FOR CLOSURES

Shot No.	Type Closure	Loading Pressure kPa    psi	Ambient Pressure kPa	Ambient Temperature °C	Opening Width cm    in.	Damage to Closure
8-83-2	Al skins/I-Beams 7.62 cm (3 in.)	253    36.7	100.7	29.4	121.9    48	Broken out
8-83-3	Al Skins/I-Beams- 7.62 cm (3 in.)	247    35.8	100.8	6.7	121.9    48	Broken out
8-83-4	Pine Beams- 12.06 cm (4-3/4 in.) thick	351    50.9	101.8	8.9	121.9    48	Broken out
8-83-5	Pine Beams- 12.7 cm (5 in.) thick	347    50.3	102.0	16.1	121.9    48	Broken out
8-83-6	Oak Planks- 5.08 cm (2 in.) thick w/sand bags	344    49.9	101.8	16.7	121.9    48	Broken out
8-83-7	Oak Beams- 12.7 cm (5 in.) thick	342    49.6	102.7	27.8	121.9    48	1 beam cracked
8-83-8	Oak Beams- 7.62 cm (3 in.) thick	344    49.9	100.1	0.6	76.2    30	Broken out





Figure 7. Input Loading - Time Records.





Figure 7 (Cont'd). Input Loading - Time Records.





Figure 7 (Cont'd). Input Loading - Time Records.





Figure 7 (Cont'd). Input Loading - Time Records.

Shot 8-83-2



0 ms



20 ms



14 ms



26 ms



18 ms



34 ms

Figure 8. Aluminum Skin/I-Beam Closure - 247 kPa (35.8 psi).



Shot 8-83-2




38 ms



50 ms



42 ms



54 ms



46 ms




58 ms

Figure 8 (Cont'd). Aluminum Skin/I-Beam Closure - 247 kPa (35.8 psi).


Shot 8-83-2




62 ms



70 ms



66 ms



74 ms

Figure 8 (Cont'd). Aluminum Skin/I-Beam Closure - 247 kPa (35.8 psi).

Shot 8-83-4



0 ms




36 ms



14 ms



46 ms



24 ms



56 ms

Figure 9. Pine Beam Closure - 351 kPa (50.9 psi).

Shot 8-83-4




64 ms



94 ms




74 ms



104 ms



84 ms



114 ms

Figure 9 (Cont'd). Pine Beam Closure - 351 kPa (50.9 psi).

Shot 8-83-4



124 ms



144 ms




134 ms



154 ms

Figure 9 (Cont'd). Pine Beam Closure - 351 kPa (50.9 psi).


Shot 8-83-5



0 ms



36 ms



16 ms



46 ms



26 ms



56 ms

Figure 10. Pine Beam Closure - 347 kPa (50.3 psi).

Shot 8-83-5




66 ms



96 ms



76 ms



106 ms




86 ms




116 ms

Figure 10 (Cont'd). Pine Beam Closure - 347 kPa (50.3 psi).

Shot 8-83-5



126 ms




156 ms



136 ms



166 ms



146 ms

Figure 10 (Cont'd). Pine Beam Closure - 347 kPa (50.3 psi).



Average velocities of about 40 m/s were observed after 64 ms.

Shot 8-83-6, with sand bags, is obscured with flying sand very quickly in Figure 11. The sand bags effectively delayed the breaking of the oak planks; very little debris exited before 70 ms. The pressure-time record for Shot 8-83-6, Figure 7 above points this delay out also.

The next section shows a series of still photographs of the closures, illustrating in more detail the failure modes.

#### D. Failure Modes

Figure 12 illustrates the mounted closure in the upper picture and portions of the closure in the lower picture after exposure to the shock wave. Almost without exception, the plug welds broke from the I-beams without leaving the skins. Neither of the two aluminum closures tested were satisfactory for the key worker blast pressure levels.

Figure 13 shows results from the tests of the pine beam closures. The failure was primarily about the flange opening's vertical centerline. The scattered broken beams were gathered from over the test area for this posed picture.

Figure 14 shows a slight break in the center beam after exposure to the blast loading. Notice the almost complete lack of knots as compared to the pine closure. This closure successfully contained the blast wave; no blast pressure escaped. These beams were judged to be No. 1 grade since there were almost no knots.


Figure 15 shows the results of the oak plank/sand bag closure. As noted from the high speed photographs, failure did not occur until after perhaps 50 ms. This closure was just on the borderline of being satisfactory. One beam did remain in the test fixture but all sand bags were blown out. Figure 15-C shows the shredded state of the sand bags collected after the shot.

Finally, Figure 16, shows the method of mounting the oak beam closure over a 76.2 cm (30 in.) opening. The mounting braces and the closure were completely removed during the blast wave exposure. It is felt that the closure did contain the blast for a short time (perhaps 30 ms) until the steel side mounts were torn loose. The closure might have withstood the blast loading if the side mounts had remained intact. The plank/sand bag closure is considered to be marginal at the pressure level tested.


#### IV. ANALYSIS

The analysis follows the upgrading procedures found in Reference 5. See Table 2 for material properties.

Shot 8-83-6



0 ms




50 ms



10 ms



70 ms




30 ms



90 ms

Figure 11. Sand Bag/Plank Closure - 344 kPa (49.9 psi).

Shot 8-83-6




110 ms



150 ms




130 ms




170 ms

Figure 11 (Cont'd). Sand Bag/Plank Closure - 344 kPa (49.9 psi).



A. Pre-Shot 8-83-3




B. Post-Shot 8-83-3

Figure 12. Failure Mode for Aluminum Closure - 247 kPa (35.8 psi).




A. Pre-Shot 8-83-5




B. Post-Shot 8-83-5

Figure 13. Failure Mode for Pine Beam Closure - 347 kPa (50.3 psi).



C. Post-Shot 8-83-4

Figure 13 (Cont'd). Failure Mode for Pine Beam Closure - 347 kPa (50.3 psi).




A. Pre-Shot 8-83-7




B. Post-Shot 8-83-7

Figure 14. Oak Beam Closure - 342 kPa (49.6 psi).



A. Pre-Shot 8-83-6



B. Post-Shot 8-83-6

Figure 15. Oak Plank/Sand Bag - 344 kPa (49.9 psi).






C. Sand Bags from Shot 8-83-6



D. Oak Planks from Shot 8-83-6

Figure 15 (Cont'd). Oak Plank/Sand Bag - 344 kPa (49.9 psi).



Pre-Shot 8-83-8

Figure 16. Oak Beam Closure, 76.2 cm (30 in.).

TABLE 2. MATERIAL PROPERTIES OF THE CLOSURES

Material	Grade	$F_b$ kPa	$F_b$ psi	$F_v$ kPa	$F_v$ psi	E kPa	E psi	G kPa	G psi	Yield Strength kPa	Yield Strength psi	Shear Strength kPa	Shear Strength psi
Aluminum Sheet 0.318 cm (1/8 in.)	6061-T6 <sup>a</sup>	-	-	-	-	68.95x10 <sup>6</sup>	10x10 <sup>6</sup>	26.2x10 <sup>6</sup>	3.8x10 <sup>6</sup>	144,799	21,000	165,474	24,000
Aluminum I-Beam 7.62 cm (3 in.)	6061-T6	-	-	-	-	68.95x10 <sup>6</sup>	10x10 <sup>6</sup>	26.2x10 <sup>6</sup>	3.8x10 <sup>6</sup>	275,790	40,000	206,842	30,000
Pine Beam 12.7 cm (5 in.)	No. 2 <sup>b</sup>	5,860	850	482.6	70	8.96x10 <sup>6</sup>	1.3x10 <sup>6</sup>	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oak Beam 12.7 cm (5 in.)	No. 1 <sup>c</sup>	8,274	1200	586.0	85	12.41x10 <sup>6</sup>	1.8x10 <sup>6</sup>	-	-	-	-	-	-

<sup>a</sup>See References 8 and 9.<sup>b</sup>See Reference 10.<sup>c</sup>The oak beams were ungraded, but were judged visually to be No. 1 grade timber.

#### A. Aluminum Skin/I-Beam Closure

Horizontal shear was found to be the weakest failure mode of plywood skin/wood stringer panels. A check of bending deflection, and horizontal shear showed it to be true, also for the aluminum skin/I-beam closure. The allowable total load-horizontal shear was calculated from the following equation:

$$P_v = (2 F_v t / (2l' Q_v)) (EI_g / E_{I\text{-beam}}), \quad (1)$$

where  $P_v$  = allowable load-horizontal shear (kPa),  
 $F_v$  = allowable stress in I-beam weld-shear (kPa),  
 $t$  = average weld width distributed along all the I-beams (cm),  
 $EI_g$  = stiffness factor from Figure 17 (kPa-cm<sup>4</sup>),  
 $E_{I\text{-beam}}$  = modulus of elasticity (kPa),  
 $l$  = clear span of panel, direction of I-beams (cm),  
 $l'$  = width of panel (cm), and  
 $Q_v = Q_{I\text{-beam}} + Q_{\text{skin}} (E_{\text{skin}} / E_{I\text{-beam}})$ .

Property values were taken from References 8 and 9. The terms of  $Q_v$  are:

$Q_{I\text{-beam}}$  = cross section of all I-beams above or below neutral axis (N.A.) multiplied by its centroidal distance from N.A. (cm<sup>3</sup>).

$Q_{\text{skin}} = A_{11}$  for skin multiplied by moment arm (cm<sup>3</sup>), and

$E$ 's = moduli of elasticity (kPa).

For values of  $F_v = 165,474$  kPa,  $t = 0.61$  cm,  $EI_g = 15.86 \times 10^{10}$  kPa-cm<sup>4</sup>,  
 $E_{I\text{-beam}} = 68.95 \times 10^6$  kPa,  $l = 121.9$  cm,  $l' = 167.0$  cm,  $Q_v = 304.5$  cm<sup>3</sup>, and  
 $E_{\text{skin}} = 68.95 \times 10^6$  kPa, the allowable horizontal stress,  $P_v = 74.76$  kPa (10.84 psi).

The dynamic load required to cause ultimate failure is:

$$P_{dm} = 4 P_v (1 - 1/2\mu), \quad (2)$$


where the ductility factor,  $\mu$ , is taken as 5 for aluminum,

$$P_{dm} = 3.6 P_v. \quad (3)$$

The predicted load to cause ultimate failure of the aluminum skin/I-beam closure is 269.1 kPa (39.02 psi).

<sup>8</sup> Handbook, Atlantic Copper and Brass Co., 317 President St., Baltimore, MD 21202, May 1977.

<sup>9</sup> Theodore Baumeister, Editor, Marks' Mechanical Engineers' Handbook, Sixth Edition, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, NY, 1958.



	$E$ kPa	$I$ $\text{cm}^4$	$A_{II}$ $\text{cm}^2$	$d_I$ cm	$d_{I2}^2$ $\text{cm}^2$	$A_{II} d_I^2$ $\text{cm}^4$	$I + A_{II} d_I^2$ $\text{cm}^4$	$E(I + A_{II} d_I^2)$ kPa - $\text{cm}^4$
FACE SHEET	$68.95 \times 10^6$	0.44	53.01	3.97	15.74	834.62	835.06	$5.75 \times 10^{10}$
I-BEAM	$68.95 \times 10^6$	632.46	60.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	632.46	$4.36 \times 10^{10}$

$$EI_g = 15.86 \times 10^{10} \text{ kPa} - \text{cm}^4$$

Figure 17. Calculation of Stiffness Factor for Aluminum Skin/I-Beam Closure.

## B. Wood Beam Closure

Primary modes of failure, Reference 5, are in bending and horizontal shear. The relation for bending resistance is given as Equation 4:

$$q_b = 0.5 F_b (d/l)^2 / (3C), \quad (4)$$

where

$F_b$  = extreme fiber stress in bending (kPa),

$d$  = thickness (depth) of beam (cm),

$l$  = clear span (cm), and

$C$  = 1/8 for simply supported beams.

For values of  $F_b = 5,860$  and  $8,274$  kPa,<sup>10</sup>  $d = 12.7$  cm,  $l = 121.9$  cm, and  $C = 1/8$ , the allowable stress in bending  $q_b$  is  $84.8$  kPa ( $12.3$  psi) and  $119.7$  kPa ( $17.4$  psi).

The dynamic load to cause ultimate failure in bending is:

$$P_{dm} = 4 q_b (1 - 1/2\mu), \quad (5)$$

where  $\mu$  is taken as 3 for wood.

$$P_{dm} = 3.333 q_b. \quad (6)$$

The predicted loads to cause ultimate failure in bending are  $282.6$  kPa ( $41.0$  psi) for the No. 2 pine and  $399.0$  kPa ( $58.0$  psi) for the No. 1 oak.

The horizontal shear resistance is found from Equation 7:

$$q_v = 2F_v d (3c' (l - 2d)), \quad (7)$$

where

$F_v$  = horizontal shear stress (kPa),

$d$  = thickness (depth) of beam (cm),

$c' = 1/2$  for simply supported beams, and

$l$  = clear span (cm).

For values of  $F_v = 482.6$  (for pine) and  $586$  kPa (for oak),  $d = 12.7$  cm,  $c' = 1/2$ , and  $l$  of  $121.9$  the allowable stress in horizontal shear,  $q_v$ , is  $84.6$  kPa ( $12.3$  psi) for the No. 2 pine and  $102.8$  kPa ( $14.9$  psi) for the No. 1 oak.

The dynamic load to cause ultimate failure in horizontal shear is calculated from Equation 6 with  $q_v$  used instead of  $q_b$ . The two values (for pine and oak) are  $282.0$  kPa ( $40.9$  psi) and  $342.6$  kPa ( $49.7$  psi).

Comparing the two modes of failure, bending and shear, the shear is somewhat weaker and should be used for predictions of the ultimate failure to be expected for the beam closures.

<sup>10</sup>"Design Values for Wood Construction - A Supplement to the 1977 Edition of National Design Specification for Wood Construction," National Forest Products Association, 1619 Mass Ave., NW Wash., DC 20036, April 1980.

Table 3 compares these predicted values of failure with the experimental results. No failure predictions were attempted for the sand bag/plank closure.

It would have been more desirable to have chosen a greater variety of materials to be exposed to the blast wave loading. However, funding limitations would not permit this. Figure 18 shows the prediction curves from Reference 6 (for 276 kPa) converted to metric scale and upgraded to key worker area pressure as requested by the FEMA project office.

As noted previously in the results section, only one shot was fired with the sand bags in place. The closure did fail but only after a relatively long time. The curve for "closure - with sand bags" can at best be considered marginal at the test level of 345 kPa.

The closures, with no sand bags as noted, did survive with minimal damage at the stated level. There would however have been almost no safety factor remaining since one timber member was cracked during the shots. It is felt, however, that both curves of Figure 18 would have been accurate for the level of 276 kPa as originally presented in Reference 6. The results of these tests indicate the curves should not be upgraded to the higher level of input blast pressure.

#### V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The present work is a part of a research program sponsored by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to upgrade existing shelters for key worker areas. FEMA has sponsored the present research program at the Ballistic Research Laboratory (BRL) to determine the functional relationship between a particular thickness of closure material and the opening size to be covered. It was the desire of the FEMA project office to upgrade the anticipated pressure level for an existing set of closure material curves as given in Reference 6.

BRL designed and tested a set of closures to determine if the closure material/closure opening curves might be upgraded to the higher pressure level. Aluminum skin/I-beam and wood beam closures were exposed in the BRL 2.44 m shock tube at the increased pressure level of 344 kPa (49.9 psi). All closures tested failed completely except for the single oak beam closure without sand bags.

It is felt by the author that only near-perfect No. 1 and better wood timbers could be used for closures at the upgraded pressure level. The welds joining the aluminum skin/I-beam closures failed also at this level.

It is recommended that the particular materials versus opening size curves not be upgraded to a higher pressure level. No margin of safety is believed to exist at the higher level tested. Protection at this pressure level (344 kPa) could not be expected with most available lower grade materials. Revised curves should be published if the higher pressure level is desired by the FEMA project office.

TABLE 3. VALUES FOR ULTIMATE FAILURE

Type Closure	Allowable Static Load		Ultimate Failure Predicted		Experiment		Ratio Allowable Load
	kpa	psi	kpa	psi	kpa	psi	
Aluminum Skins/ I-Beams 7.62 cm (3 in.)	74.8	10.8	269.1	39.0	<247	35.8	-
Pine Beams 12.7 cm (5 in.)	84.6	12.3	282.0	40.9	<347	50.3	-
Oak Beams 12.7 cm (5 in.)	102.8	14.9	342.6	49.7	344	49.9	3.3
2x's Placed* Flat-3.81 cm (1.5 in.) thick	82.7	12.0	276	40.0	420	60.9	5.1

\*Taken from Reference 2.






Figure 18. Material Thickness Required to Close Various Openings at the 345 kPa Ground Range.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to thank Messrs. Kenneth Holbrook, James Bernhardt, and Sterling Dunbar for the careful experimental work performed at the BRL Shock Tube Facility.

## REFERENCES

1. G.A. Coulter, "Debris Hazard from Blast Loaded Plywood Sheet Closures," Memorandum Report ARBRL-MR-02917, Ballistic Research Laboratory, March 1979 (AD A071460).
2. G.A. Coulter, "Blast Loading of Construction Materials and Closure Designs," Memorandum Report ARBRL-MR-02947, Ballistic Research Laboratory, August 1979 (AD A077116).
3. G.A. Coulter, "Blast Loading of Wall Panels and Commercial Closures," Memorandum Report ARBRL-MR-03154, Ballistic Research Laboratory, February 1982 (AD B063574L).
4. G.A. Coulter, "Blast Loading of Closures for Use on Shelters," Memorandum Report ARBRL-MR-03279, Ballistic Research Laboratory, June 1983 (AD A130028).
5. H.L. Murphy, "Upgrading Basements for Combined Nuclear Effects: Predesigned Expedient Options II," SRI Project 6876 Technical Report, July 1980.
6. "Industrial Protection Manual, Booklet 10," SSI Report No. 8011, Scientific Service, Inc., June 1981 (AD A102631).
7. B.P. Bertrand, "BRL Dual Shock Tube Facility," Ballistic Research Laboratory Memorandum Report 2001, August 1969 (AD 693264).
8. Handbook, Atlantic Copper and Brass Co., 317 President St., Baltimore, MD 21202, May 1977.
9. Theodore Baumeister, Editor, Marks' Mechanical Engineers' Handbook, Sixth Edition, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, NY, 1958.
10. "Design Values for Wood Construction - A Supplement to the 1977 Edition of National Design Specification for Wood Construction," National Forest Products Association, 1619 Mass Ave., NW Wash., DC 20036, April 1980.

# DISTRIBUTION LIST

<u>No. of</u> <u>Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>No. of</u> <u>Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
12	Administrator Defense Technical Information Center ATTN: DTIC-DDA Cameron Station Alexandria, VA 22314	1	Associate Director Natural Resources & Comm Svcs Office of Science & Tech Policy Executive Office Bldg. Washington, DC 20500
1	Director Defense Intelligence Agency ATTN: CKW DB-4C2, C. Wiehle Washington, DC 20301	1	Commander US Army Materiel Development and Readiness Command ATTN: DRCDMD-ST 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333
2	Director Defense Nuclear Agency ATTN: SPSS (Mr. T. Kennedy) STTI (TITL, Library) Washington, DC 20305	1	Commander US Army Aviation Research and Development Command ATTN: DRDAV-E 4300 Goodfellow Blvd St. Louis, MO 63120
3	Director Federal Emergency Mgmt Agcy Civil Defense Division ATTN: Admin Officer Washington, DC 20472	1	Director US Army Air Mobility Research and Development Laboratory Ames Research Center Moffett Field, CA 94035
60	Director Federal Emergency Mgmt Agcy ATTN: Dr. Michael Pachuta National Preparedness Programs Directorate Industrial Protect. Div. Washington, DC 20472	1	Commander US Army Electronics Research and Development Command Technical Support Activity ATTN: DELSD-L Fort Monmouth, NJ 07703
1	Director Federal Emergency Mgmt Agcy ATTN: Assistant Associate Director for Research National Preparedness Programs Directorate Washington, DC 20472	1	Commander US Army Communications Research and Development Command ATTN: DRSEL-ATDD Fort Monmouth, NJ 07703
1	Director Federal Emergency Mgmt Agcy Office of Civil Preparedness ATTN: Mr. Donald A. Bettge National Preparedness Programs Washington, DC 20472	1	Commander US Army Missile Command ATTN: DRSMI-R Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898
		1	Commander US Army Missile Command ATTN: DRSMI-YDL Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898

# DISTRIBUTION LIST

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
2	Commandant US Army Infantry School ATTN: ATSH-CP-CSO-OR Fort Benning, GA 31905	1	Commander US Army Natick Research and Development Laboratory ATTN: DRDNA-DT, Dr. D. Sieling Natick, MA 01760
1	Commander US Army Tank Automotive Command ATTN: DRSTA-TSL Warren, MI 48090	1	Director DARCOM Field Safety Activity ATTN: DRXOS-ES Charlestown, IN 47111
1	Commander US Army Mobility Equipment Rsch and Development Command ATTN: DRDME-WC Fort Belvoir, VA 22060	1	Director US Army TRADOC Systems Analysis Activity ATTN: ATAA-SL WSMR, NM 88002
1	Commander US Army Armament, Munitions and Chemical Command ATTN: DRSMC-LEP-L(R) Rock Island, IL 61299	1	Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (R&D) ATTN: Assistant for Research Washington, DC 20310
3	Commander Armament R&D Center US Army AMCCOM ATTN: DRSMC-TSS(D) DRSMC-TDC(D) Dover, NJ 07801	1	Chief of Engineers Department of the Army ATTN: ENGEME-RD Washington, DC 20314
1	Director Benet Weapons Laboratory Armament R&D Center US Army AMCCOM ATTN: DRSMC-LCB-TL(D) Watervliet, NY 12189	1	Director Argonne National Laboratories ESS Division ATTN: Dr. J. Michael Clinch 9700 S. Cass Avenue Argonne, IL 60439
1	Commander US Army Harry Diamond Labs ATTN: DELHD-TA-L 2800 Powder Mill Road Adelphi, MD 20783	3	Commander USAE Waterways Experiment Station ATTN: Document Library Mr. W. L. Huff Nuc Wpns Eff Br P.O. Box 631 Vicksburg, MS 39181
1	Commander US Army Materials & Mechanics Research Center ATTN: DRXMR-ATL Watertown, MA 02172	3	Commander Naval Air Systems Command ATTN: AIR-604 Washington, DC 20360

# DISTRIBUTION LIST

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
1	Commander Naval Facilities Eng Command ATTN: R&D Code 0322C Washington, DC 20360	1	AFWL (Tech Library) Kirtland AFB, NM 87117
3	Commander Naval Sea Systems Command ATTN: SEA-62R, SEA-62Y, SEA-9961 Washington, DC 20360	1	Civil Engineering Center AF/PRECET Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433
3	Commander Naval Supply Systems Command ATTN: Code 0652 Washington, DC 20390	1	Civil Engineering Center AF/PRECET Tyndall AFB, FL 32403
1	HQDA (DAEN, ENGME-RD) Washington, DC 20310	2	Center for Planning and Research, Inc. ATTN: John R. Rempel Richard Laurino 2483 East Bayshore - Suite 104 Palo Alto, CA 94303
1	Commander Naval Supply Systems Command ATTN: Code 0421G Department of the Navy Washington, DC 20390	2	Headquarters US Energy Research and Development Administration Department of Military Applications Division of Biology & Medicine ATTN: Civil Eff Br, Mr. L. Deal Dr. Rudolf J. Engelmann Washington, DC 20545
1	Chief of Naval Personnel ATTN: Code Pers M12 Department of the Navy Washington, DC 20350	1	Director Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory ATTN: Document Library P.O. Box 1663 Los Alamos, NM 87544
1	Chief of Naval Research 800 N. Quincy Street Arlington, VA 22217	1	Office of Federal Building Tech Center for Building Technology ATTN: Mr. Samuel Kramer, Chief National Bureau of Standards Washington, DC 20234
1	Officer in Charge (Code L31) Civil Engineering Lab ATTN: Document Library Port Hueneme, CA 93041		
1	AFWL (SUL) Kirtland AFB, NM 87117		
1	AFWL (Civil Eng Div) Kirtland AFB, NM 87117		

# DISTRIBUTION LIST

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
1	National Bureau of Standards US Dept of Commerce ATTN: Dr. Lewis V. Spencer RM C313-Building 245 Washington, DC 20234	1	Human Sciences Research Inc. ATTN: Dr. William Chenault Westgate Industrial Park 7710 Old Springhouse Road McLean, VA 22102
1	Aggabian Associates 250 North Nash Street El Segundo, CA 90245	1	Institute for Defense Analyses Program Analysis Division ATTN: Mr. Leo A. Schmidt 1801 Beauregard St Alexandria, VA 22311
1	Applied Research & Associates ATTN: Cornelius J. Higgins 2601 Wyoming Blvd., Suite H-1 Albuquerque, NM 87112	1	Director Lovelace Research Institute ATTN: Dr. Donald Richmond P.O. Box 5890 Albuquerque, NM 87115
1	BDM Corporation ATTN: Mr. Jud Leech P.O. Box 9274 Albuquerque, NM 87119	1	H.L. Murphy Associates Box 1727 San Mateo, CA 94401
1	Mr. James Beck & Associates 4216 Los Palos Avenue Palo Alto, CA 94306	1	Pacific-Sierra Research Corp ATTN: Harold L. Brode 1456 Cloverfield Blvd Santa Monica, CA 90404
3	Bell Telephone Labs, Inc. ATTN: Mr. E. Witt Mr. R. May Mr. J. Foss Whippany Road Whippany, NJ 07981	1	Physics International Company 2700 Merced Street San Leandro, CA 94577
1	The Dikewood Corporation 1613 University Blvd Albuquerque, NM 87102	1	The Rand Corporation ATTN: Document Library 1700 Main Street Santa Monica, CA 90406
1	Eberle Smith Associates, Inc. ATTN: Mr. Lyndon Welch 950 West Fort Street Detroit, MI 48226	1	R&D Associates ATTN: Dr. Henry Cooper 1401 Wilson Blvd. Rosslyn, VA 22209
1	General American Transportation Corporation General American Research Div 7449 North Natchez Avenue Niles, IL 60648	1	Ryland Research, Inc. ATTN: Harvey G. Ryland 5266 Hollister Ave, Suite 324 Santa Barbara, CA 93111

# DISTRIBUTION LIST

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
2	Director Sandia National Laboratory ATTN: Dir 5412, L. Vortman Div 1112, Dr. Mehl Albuquerque, NM 87115	1	Purdue University Purdue Research Foundation School of Civil Engineering ATTN: Mr. M. Scott Civil Engineering Building West Lafayette, IN 47906
1	Stan Martin & Associates ATTN: Dr. Stanley B. Martin 860 Vista Drive Redwood City, CA 94062	1	Director Program for Energy Research, Education & Public Service ATTN: Prof. Robert Bailey Oxley Hall, 1712 Neil Ave Columbus, OH 43210
1	Science Applications, Inc. ATTN: Dr. John Cockayne 1710 Goodridge Drive P.O. Box 1303 McLean, VA 22102	2	Research Triangle Institute ATTN: Edward L. Hill Milton D. Wright P.O. Box 12194 Research Triangle Park NC 27709
1	University of Santa Clara ATTN: Prof. R.K. Pefley Santa Clara, CA 95053	1	San Jose State College Dept of Civil Engineering ATTN: Dr. B. Gabrielson San Jose, CA 95114
1	SRI International ATTN: Mr. Raymond Alger 333 Ravenswood Avenue Menlo Park, CA 94025	1	Texas Technological College ATTN: Mr. Joseph E. Minor Lubbock, TX 79408
1	TRW Systems Group ATTN: Mr. B. Sussholz One Space Park, R-1/2094 Redondo Beach, CA 90278	1	Worcester Polytechnic Institute Dept of Civil Engineering ATTN: Prof. C. Koontz Worcester, MA 01609
1	George Washington University School of Engineering and Applied Science Nuclear Defense Design Center ATTN: Prof. R. Fox Washington, DC 20037	1	University of Colorado School of Architecture ATTN: Prof. G. Vetter Boulder, CO 80304
1	IIT Research Institute ATTN: Mr. T. Waterman 10 West 35th Street Chicago, IL 60616	1	University of Massachusetts School of Civil Engineering ATTN: Dr. M.P. White Amherst, MA 01002
1	Pennsylvania State University ATTN: Prof. R. Kummer 101 Eng A University Park, PA 16802		



# DISTRIBUTION LIST

<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>No. of Copies</u>	<u>Organization</u>
1	University of Illinois ATTN: Dr. W. Hall 111 Talbot Laboratory Urbana, IL 61801	1	Mr. Lewis V. Spencer Room C313-Building 245 Washington, DC 20234
1	Illinois Institute of Tech ATTN: Mr. Anatole Longinow 3201 S. Dearborn, R 215 Chicago, IL 60616	1	Mr. Walmer (Jerry) Strobe 5600 Columbia Pike, Suite 101 Bailey's Crossroads, VA 22041
2	University of Florida ATTN: Dept of Mech Engr. Prof. J. Samuel Civil Defense Technical Services Center College of Engineering Dept of Engineering Gainesville, FL 32601	<u>Aberdeen Proving Ground</u>	
1	University of Washington Dept. of Civil Engineering ATTN: Prof. W. Miller 207 More Hall Seattle, WA 98105	Dir, USAMSAA ATTN: DRXSY-D DRXSY-G, Mr. R. Norman DRXSY-MP, H. Cohen Cdr, USATECOM ATTN: DRSTE-TO-F Cdr. CRDC, AMCCOM ATTN: DRSMC-CLB-PA DRSMC-CLN DRSMC-CLJ-L	

### USER EVALUATION OF REPORT

Please take a few minutes to answer the questions below; tear out this sheet, fold as indicated, staple or tape closed, and place in the mail. Your comments will provide us with information for improving future reports.

1. BRL Report Number \_\_\_\_\_

2. Does this report satisfy a need? (Comment on purpose, related project, or other area of interest for which report will be used.)

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

3. How, specifically, is the report being used? (Information source, design data or procedure, management procedure, source of ideas, etc.) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

4. Has the information in this report led to any quantitative savings as far as man-hours/contract dollars saved, operating costs avoided, efficiencies achieved, etc.? If so, please elaborate.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

5. General Comments (Indicate what you think should be changed to make this report and future reports of this type more responsive to your needs, more usable, improve readability, etc.) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

6. If you would like to be contacted by the personnel who prepared this report to raise specific questions or discuss the topic, please fill in the following information.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Organization Address: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

FOLD HERE

Director  
US Army Ballistic Research Laboratory  
ATTN: DRSMC-BLA-S (A)  
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005



NO POSTAGE  
NECESSARY  
IF MAILED  
IN THE  
UNITED STATES

OFFICIAL BUSINESS  
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE. \$300

**BUSINESS REPLY MAIL**  
FIRST CLASS PERMIT NO 12062 WASHINGTON, DC  
POSTAGE WILL BE PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Director  
US Army Ballistic Research Laboratory  
ATTN: DRSMC-BLA-S (A)  
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005



FOLD HERE

END

1911/11/13

5-84

DTN